REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 17-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 12-13, 15, 17, 25 and 27-29 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-7 of the Reply.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the teleconference of December 16, 2008.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Claim 29 recites computer readable medium, however the term is not defined in the specification. Claim 29 has been amended to correct any deficiencies related to this objection, as such the objection is moot and should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-12 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. Claims 1-12 have been amended to correct any deficiencies related to this rejection, as such the rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-15 and 17-28 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-15 and 17-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 1 has been amended herein to clearly illustrate that elements within such claims are components associated with a computer processor. In particular, claim 1 as amended is directed towards a junk message interface system that facilitates identifying junk messages, comprising: ***a processor for executing the following components***; ... (Support for these amendments can be found on pg. 5, lines 24-31). Accordingly, this claim includes functional descriptive material within a computer processor, thereby rendering it structurally and functionally interrelated to the computer

processor and is therefore directed to statutory subject matter. Claims 13, 15, 27 and 28 have been similarly amended. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn with regard to claims 1-15 and 17-28.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12-15, and 17-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12-15, and 17-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Rajan *et al.* (US 2005/0165895). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Rajan *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter relates to a system and method that facilitate viewing and organizing incoming messages based on their respective junk ratings. In particular, independent claim 1 recites a junk message interface system that facilitates identifying junk messages, comprising: *a message receiving component that collects at least one incoming message;* ***a filtering component that accepts the incoming message communicated from the message receiving component and determines whether a sender is known or trusted before scanning the message with a filter and determining a junk score for the incoming message,*** *the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk,* ***wherein once the message has been scored, the message is bucketized based on the determined junk score and tagged with a junk rating which is added as a property on the message,*** *and wherein a user can override the junk score via a user-based action that affects the junk score of the message and future messages; and a display component that renders the junk scores as an actionable property on a user interface to facilitate user management of incoming junk messages communicated from the filtering component.* The cited reference does not expressly or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in the subject claims.

Rajan *et al.* discloses a method and system that provides in addition to the conventional "Inbox" directory in which all incoming mail is normally received, a plurality of appropriately labeled directories for containing e-mails suspected of being spam, grading the level of spaminess of the incoming e-mail and then moving or copying incoming e-mail into one or more

of the spam directories based upon the e-mail's respective level of spaminess. (*See* pg. 2, paragraph [0014]).

In contrast, applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk message interface system, wherein messages are tagged with a junk rating and such rating can be added or saved as a property on the message. The system comprises a message receiving component that accepts incoming messages as they arrive at a user's server or personal computer (PC). The incoming messages can be communicated to a filtering component comprising one or more junk filters. The junk filter can score each message based on its spam confidence level, or rather, the likelihood that the message is junk. The score can be a value between 0 and 1. Once the message has been scored, it can be bucketized into an appropriate junk rating based at least in part on its junk score. (*See* pg. 9, line 23 – pg. 10, line 7).

Rajan *et al.* merely discloses a system that grades e-mail according to the level of spaminess and then moves the e-mail into the appropriately labeled directory. A user can then review the mail in each directory with a level of care commensurate with the assigned spaminess range associated with each directory. (See pg. 2, paragraph [0017]). Rajan *et al.* does not disclose determining whether the sender is known or trusted before scanning the message with a filter and determining a junk score, as in applicants' claimed subject matter. Applicants' claimed subject matter scans a message to determine if the sender is known, before determining a junk score and then once the junk score is determined, the message is bucketized based on the junk score. Rajan *et al.* discloses grading e-mails and placing the e-mails into the appropriate directory, and does not scan a message to determine if the sender is known. Further, applicants' claimed subject matter discloses bucketizing the messages based on their junk scores and tagging them with a junk rating which is added as a property on the message. The graded e-mails of Rajan *et al.* are merely placed in directories for later review by a user and are not tagged with a junk rating which is added as a property on the message.

Further, independent claim 13 recites a user interface that facilitates identifying junk messages comprising: *a junk rating field that can be acted upon by a user, the junk rating being determined at least in part upon by determining a junk score and at least in part upon an analysis of the junk score,* ***the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of a message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk***.

Rajan *et al.* merely discloses providing in addition to the conventional "Inbox" directory in which all incoming mail is normally received, a plurality of appropriately labeled directories for containing e-mails suspected of being spam. A user can then review the mail in each directory with a level of care commensurate with the assigned spaminess range associated with each directory. Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk rating field that scores each message based on its spam confidence level, or rather, the likelihood that the message is junk. The junk score can be any value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk.

Furthermore, independent claim 15 recites a method that facilitates identification of junk messages in a user's inbox, comprising: *receiving a plurality of incoming messages;* ***determining whether a sender is known or trusted; assigning a junk rating to the messages;*** *exposing at least the junk rating on a user interface; calculating a junk score for substantially all incoming messages, the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk;* ***bucketizing the message based on the calculated junk score; tagging the message with a junk rating which is added as a property on the message****; and overriding the junk score via a user-based action that affects the junk score of the message and future messages.*

As stated *supra*, Rajan *et al.* merely discloses a system that grades e-mail according to the level of spaminess and then moves the e-mail into the appropriately labeled directory. A user can then review the mail in each directory with a level of care commensurate with the assigned spaminess range associated with each directory. Rajan *et al.* does not disclose determining whether the sender is known or trusted before scanning the message with a filter and determining a junk score, as in applicants' claimed subject matter. Applicants' claimed subject matter scans a message to determine if the sender is known, before determining a junk score and then once the junk score is determined, the message is bucketized based on the junk score. Rajan *et al.* discloses grading e-mails and placing the e-mails into the appropriate directory, and does not scan a message to determine if the sender is known. Further, applicants' claimed subject matter discloses bucketizing the messages based on their junk scores and tagging them with a junk rating which is added as a property on the message. The graded e-mails of Rajan *et al.* are

merely placed in directories for later review by a user and are not tagged with a junk rating which is added as a property on the message.

Furthermore, independent claim 27 recites a system that facilitates identification of junk messages in a user's inbox, comprising: *means for receiving a plurality of incoming messages;* ***means for determining whether a sender is known or trusted; means for calculating a junk score for substantially all incoming messages,*** *the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk; means for assigning a junk rating to the messages commensurate with at least their respective junk scores; means for exposing at least one of the junk rating and the junk score on a user interface;* ***means for bucketizing the message based on the calculated junk score; means for tagging the message with a junk rating which is added as a property on the message****; and means for overriding the junk score via a user-based action that affects the junk score of the message and future messages.*

As stated *supra*, Rajan *et al.* merely discloses a system that grades e-mail according to the level of spaminess and then moves the e-mail into the appropriately labeled directory. Rajan *et al.* does not disclose determining whether the sender is known or trusted before scanning the message with a filter and determining a junk score, as in applicants' claimed subject matter. Applicants' claimed subject matter scans a message to determine if the sender is known, before determining a junk score and then once the junk score is determined, the message is bucketized based on the junk score. Further, applicants' claimed subject matter discloses tagging the bucketized messages with a junk rating which is added as a property on the message.

Furthermore, independent claim 28 recites a data packet adapted to be transmitted between two or more computer processes facilitating easier viewing and management of incoming messages, the data packet comprising: *information associated with receiving a plurality of incoming messages;* ***assigning a junk rating to the messages commensurate with at least their respective junk scores, wherein the junk scores are computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, and wherein the junk scores are values or fractional values between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk****; and exposing at least one of the junk rating and the junk score on a user interface....*

As stated *supra*, Rajan *et al.* merely discloses providing in addition to the conventional "Inbox" directory in which all incoming mail is normally received, a plurality of appropriately labeled directories for containing e-mails suspected of being spam. Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk filter that scores each message based on its spam confidence level, or rather, the likelihood that the message is junk. The junk score can be any value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that the cited reference fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in the claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be deemed allowable.

V. Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.* (US 2005/0165895). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Rajan *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. As stated *supra*, Rajan *et al.* fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicants' claimed subject matter with respect to independent claim 1 (which claim 6 depends from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claim 6 is not obvious over Rajan *et al.*

VI. Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.* (US 2005/0165895) in view of Alspector *et al.* (US 2004/0148330). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Rajan *et al.* and Alspector *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Alspector *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rajan *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1 (which claim 6 depends from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claim 6 is not obvious over the combination of Rajan *et al.* and Alspector *et al.*

VII. Rejection of Claims 10 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.* (US 2005/0165895) in view of Rouse *et al.* (US 2005/0159136). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Rajan *et al.* and Rouse *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Rouse *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rajan *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1 (which claims 10-11 depend from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claims 10-11 is not obvious over the combination of Rajan *et al.* and Rouse *et al.*

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP645US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Marisa J. Zink/
Marisa J. Zink
Reg. No. 48,064

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731